

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 have been canceled, and new claims 23 and 24 have been added. Claims 23 and 24 have been presented to better protect the invention and further distinguish from the prior art. The solicitation now of these two claims substantially simplifies the issues remaining for the Examiner's consideration.

Basically, the present invention is directed toward a desiccant cartridge having a cap member with a centrally disposed aperture therein. By use of the combination of cap and docking piece as now claimed, the combination can be utilized in conjunction with air refrigeration canisters and the like having a radially offset fluid flow tube. These types of canisters may be seen, for example, in Fig. 9 of the specification. Thus, in accordance with the invention, a desiccant cartridge of the type having a centrally disposed fluid flow tube therein can be utilized in conjunction with canisters having radially offset type fluid flow conduits or tubes.

The inventive combination comprises a cap for providing closure over the cartridge. The cap has a centrally disposed first aperture therein for communication with the desiccant cartridge. A docking piece is detachably engaged in a radially extending slot formed along the surface of the cap. The docking piece comprises a housing with a second aperture therein with the second aperture being radially offset from the centrally disposed aperture in the cap. The second aperture communicates with the first aperture through the housing. Claim 24 recites a snap fit of the housing in the slot.

No new matter has been added in claims 23 and 24. It is noted that the detachable engagement of the docking piece with the cap is set forth in paragraph [0035] of the application. Note also that the central axis set forth in the claim is specified as line 20 in the drawings, and the radially extending slot that is formed along the surface of the cap is noted as member 46 in the drawings.

All of the claims of the application stand rejected on art-based grounds in light of Grahl, U.S. Patent 3,545,227, with some claims being rejected upon single application of the '227 with other claims being rejected via a combination of the '227 with Morgan, Jr. 3,814,261.

Turning first to Grahl 3,545,227, there is no hint or suggestion as to the provision of a detachable engagement of a docking piece with a cap member. In this regard, it is noted that the top cap 12 of the '227 has a central opening 14 that is closed by fitting member 17 which is brazed to the central opening 14. Further, Grahl contains no hint or suggestion as to the provision of a radially extending slot member that is formed along the surface of the cap. *Ipso facto*, Grahl '227 is therefore deficient in the provision of a docking piece comprising a housing that is detachably fit into this radially extending slot member as set forth in claim 23 and is deficient in teaching the snap fit now recited in claim 24.

The patent to Morgan, Jr. does nothing to further the primary deficiencies of the '227 Grahl patent. That is, the '261 Morgan, Jr. patent is also deficient in regard to the detachable mount of a docking piece to the cap in a radially extending slot member formed along the cap surface. Morgan, Jr. also does not teach the snap fit feature of claim 24.


The claims of the instant application also stand rejected as allegedly constituting double patenting over Hayes et al. 6,692,556. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of the instant application are patentably distinct from the claims in the aforementioned Hayes et al. patent. The claims of the Hayes et al. '556 patent have been carefully considered and nowhere can one find therein any hint or suggestion as to the provision of a docking piece as herein recited for detachable engagement with the cap portion. Further, there is no hint or suggestion as to the radially disposed slot formed along the cap surface or the snapping fit of the docking housing into the elongated radially extending slot member that is formed in the cap. Accordingly, the claims in the instant application define inventions that are not obvious variations of the inventions claimed in the Hayes et al. '556 patent. See MPEP §804 II B1.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims at bar defines patentable subject matter in full compliance with patent statutes. The issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if, during the course of reconsideration of this matter, any question or comment should arise.

Respectfully submitted,

WEGMAN, HESSLER & VANDERBURG

By: 
Bruce E. Peacock
Reg. No. 28,457

Suite 200
6055 Rockside Woods Boulevard
Cleveland, Ohio 44131
216.642.3342
February 16, 2006